

23 May 2003

Dr Dave Olson,  
Wildlife Conservation Society,  
Suva,  
Fiji.

Dear Dave,

Please find attached the report on the assignment you gave me. In the absence of any formal terms of reference, I have strictly followed the five questions you posed as constituting the scope of the assignment. The questions are -

- Task 1: Analyze forest certification approaches applied at the regional (South Pacific excluding PNG, Fiji and Solomon Islands) level;
- Task 2: Who are the relevant institutions, industries and individuals who are important in any regional level certification efforts?
- Task 3: What are the relationships between SPREP, SPC and other related bodies in regards to forest certification efforts?
- Task 4: Any SPREP programmes or funding that could or should be linked to our efforts to implement a landscape-scale certification approach in Fiji, or to any other activities we are undertaking in the first year of this Project?
- Task 5: Are there donors beyond the USAID who might be interested in supporting the kind of approaches we are advocating for forest conservation?

The prescribed scope excludes PNG, Solomon Islands and Fiji with the focus being on other Pacific Islands. I have however drawn on experiences from PNG to some extent here given the limited experiences of the other PICs.

I have also drawn heavily on my own personal experiences while in SPREP in some of the discussions including those relating to SPREP and SPC's relationship, as well as SPREP's experience with the use of income generating activities to promote and support conservation objectives.

Finally, I've interpreted literally the title of the Project as stated "Building Conservation Landscapes into Forestry Operations & Forest Certification" in my analyses. In my interpretation of this title, the initial intervention is forestry and forest certification

activities, with the conservation of landscapes either a secondary objective or a long term primary objective that is introduced on the back of the sustainable forest management platform.

Sincerely,

Sam Sesega  
Pacific Environment Consultant Ltd  
samsesega@conservation.ws

## **Task 1: Analyze forest certification approaches applied at the regional (South Pacific excluding PNG, Fiji and Solomon Islands) level;**

---

### **Introduction –**

Other than PNG and Solomon Islands, forest certification (FC) activities in other Pacific Islands (excluding Fiji which is not covered under the TOR) are very limited. It is indicative of the level of awareness and interest in forest certification, and perhaps of the economic viability of FC in the particular circumstances of Pacific Islands that this is the case.

There is also the lack of documentation on the few instances wherein FC activities are reported, for instance, in Vanuatu.

There are, however, lessons in FC that the rest of the region, especially the smaller higher islands with some forest resources, can learn from the PNG, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu experience. This section discusses the extent of forest certification work in Vanuatu, and as well PNG and Solomons in analyzing the approaches to FC that had been applied with a view on picking up lessons for future application.

### **Kinds of Certification Approaches and Forest Certification Schemes**

There are two general kinds of certification schemes:

- 1) Performance based systems such as the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC), Pan European Forest Certification Initiative (PEFC) and national schemes such as the Indonesian Ecolabelling Institute (LEI);
- 2) Environmental management systems such as the ISO 14000 series.

In terms of forest certification, the performance-based system is the widely used approach and the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) certification programme is that used within in PNG and Solomon Islands. The two forest certification programmes endorsed by FSC that are active in the region are the Rainforest Alliance's SmartWood Programme and SGS QUALIFOR, a UK based programme.

Forest certification using the performance-based approach is applied in three different ways

–

- (1) Forest Management certification
- (2) Chain-of-Custody certification and
- (3) Joint Forest Management plus Chain of Custody Certification.

Explanatory notes for the three types are provided in the box below.

These three approaches are further implemented in the field at two different levels

- (i) on an individual 'member' forest owner/manager level, or
- (ii) on a group level, where a number of forest owners or managers are certified as a group under a single certificate.

### **Reasons for Group Certification –**

#### **Advantages**

The rationale for group certification is economic, i.e. to enable small forest owners and managers to overcome diseconomies of scale by sharing the cost of certification with others

(all the costs of evaluation and monitoring through the period of certification, information and other transaction costs).

**Two forms of certification:**

*Forest management certification* – Independent, third party assessment of field-level forest management practices and/or management systems against performance indicators of special social, ecological and economic standards. Certification of forest management can potentially be carried out at different levels – forest management unit, forest owner, region, or country. Also known as forest certification or forest management auditing.

*Wood product/Chain of Custody certification* – Independent, third-party chain-of-custody inspection to trace wood harvested in certified forests through all stages of transport, processing and marketing to the finished product. Approved products are awarded a green label/eco-label certificate to verify that they are made from timber produced according to a particular set of good forest management standards.

*Joint forest management plus Chain of custody certification* – Joint certification combines the above two.

The Group Certification approach is applied in PNG and can be said to be potentially more applicable in the context of Pacific Islands and in WCS's intended context in Fiji where there will be several forest communities controlling relatively small areas of forests.

On the other hand, the Solomon Islands experience with single member certification approach demonstrates the applicability of this approach where a single company (Kolombangara Forest Products Ltd.) controls a privately owned and managed forest of a relatively significant size (39,402 hectares).

**Some disadvantages of Group Certification –**

Strength in numbers provided by Group Certification may go some way in overcoming diseconomies of scale inherent in the relatively small forest areas associated normally with local communities. On the other hand, grouping together diversified entities also have its own complications. The main ones are discussed below -

- Diversity amongst individual members in terms of technical and operational capacities, commitment to upholding acceptable standards, etc. can lead to differences in performance and compliance with acceptable management standards. There is therefore the risk that the failure of one member to comply fully with set criteria and standards can lead to 'group failure'. This is especially likely where individual members assume full forest management responsibility, and equally challenging where the Group as a unit is the responsible entity for managing all forests covered under the Group certificate.
- FSC requires that the Group entity must be an independent legal entity or an individual acting as a legal entity, in order to be eligible to apply for group certification. This condition is likely to be difficult for many community-owners where land is held communally and usually without clearly defined and mapped boundaries and where strong traditional leadership is required to secure and maintain strong community support.

Gaining group certification is therefore likely to entail a cumbersome process with significant transaction and set-up costs.

### **The EU-PNG Eco-Forestry Programme (EFP) experience with Group Certification**

The EU-PNG Eco-Forestry Programme (EFP) involved six projects each managing its' own forest with a combined certified area of 4,310 hectares. The following findings and experiences were documented by Lemeki Lenoa (SPC & GTZ Report, August 2002):

- a) Most of the present 6 projects (5 certified and 1 uncertified) are not performing very well; most communities have other agendas developed over the years, or had them initially but were not properly assessed.
- b) GSC Group Certification remains operational in a rather 'artificial' manner with EFP required to inject on-going financial subsidy and heavy staff time. Too much spoon-feeding practices have been harmful to the communities' intentions and long term development.
- c) Certification is seen to force communities in directions they are not familiar with or interested in as long as financial incentive like higher premium timber prices remain absent, and the system generally gets more difficult to understand.
- d) The projects are not autonomous with strong business support from EFP required in every development phase of the Project's business.
- e) Certification reduces the flexibility in the project design, and is felt to be a burden and makes matters more difficult. For such projects, certification only has a promising future when market mechanisms and heavy donor support cover the additional expenses required to "prove every move".

Within the same report, SPC/GTZ reported that "...the main problems identified facing such project include:

- a) High shipping/freight costs associated with cartage of timber from project sites to main centers; and
- b) Management problem related to location of projects, e.g. closer to main centers, more possibility of mismanagement (ibid.).

On the basis of these findings, "...EFP concluded that such small community-based portable sawmill operations is a generally difficult business venture with poor/low profitability. Such schemes' design are considered not yet well developed or fully operational, and thus, not yet ready for transfer to other communities and organizations" (ibid.).

A side note of importance - The European Forestry Institute (1999) noted in an PNG-wide country forest report that the development of an alternative timber industry based on small scaled sawmill, borne out of dissatisfaction with the conventional timber industry which was perceived to be non-sustainable, exploitative and frequently corrupt was successful in engaging in beneficial ways local forest owners and communities. However, it was not a replacement or substitute for the conventional industry. Consequently, it could be considered as contributing to the overexploitation of PNG's forest resource.

### **The Vanuatu Eco-forestry Experience –**

The Vanuatu Eco-Forestry experience is based on an EU funded project administered by the Foundation for the Peoples of the South Pacific International (FSPI) and involving two

local communities. The objective was to develop appropriate methods and institutions for sustainable community-based timber production and marketing using portable sawmills. A significant part of this project was the emphasis placed on marketing and the considerable efforts made in putting in place secured market access through cooperative arrangements with the New Zealand North Island Small Sawmill Association.

Country reports published by the European Forestry Institute (1999?) noted that while in the long term certification is seen as an essential marketing tool in overseas markets, current arrangements with FSC accredited certification are far too expensive given the relative small volume of timber involved. As an alternative, the Vanuatu Eco-Forestry project explored collaboration with alternative schemes that are low cost, namely the *Ecotimber* certification and labeling scheme of the New Zealand Imported Tropical Timber Group. However the *Ecotimber* label is only of use in the New Zealand market and eventual FSC certification is still the aim.

Consultations with FSPI staff in the course of this investigation (pers. comm. Sesega/Whyte/Armstrong, May 2003) revealed that the Vanuatu project never made it to the international trading stage. EU funding dried up at project end in 2001, and an additional year of funding was secured from another donor, after which the project closed at the end of 2002. Part of the underlying causes for unsustainability are implied by Armstrong (ibid.) in the following observation –

I think that the other reason was that at the time (two years ago) none of us were very sure what certification really meant - and now that we know it is too late! Lack of support and cooperation from the Forestry Dept throughout the project was also a hindrance - - these guys might go to the meetings but they don't tell us they are going and certainly don't report when they get back."

The experience of both PNG and Vanuatu points to the lack of economies of scale as a major factor in the choice for Group Certification, yet this was still insufficient to offset other economic and financial considerations.

### **Samoa –**

Consultation with Forestry officials (Lemalu<sup>1</sup>/Sesega 2003) suggests that there is very little awareness of forest certification amongst sawmillers, loggers and communities engaged in forest conservation projects and who can potentially benefit from forest certification.

Within the Ministry of Agriculture, Forests, Fisheries and Meteorology (MAFFM), the main preoccupation is the effective enforcement of the sustainable forest management policy implemented through the Code of Logging Practice, the development of a community-woodlots programme, and planning activities including the national forest inventory exercise.

There is a GTZ/MAFFM/SPC Sustainable Forest Management Project in Puapua village on the island of Savaii involving a natural forest of 400 hectares. The management of this project strictly adheres to the SFM approach and activities such as timber inventory, pre-harvesting inventory and training has been carried out with small portable sawmilling equipment now at the site for processing.

---

<sup>1</sup> Assistant Director Forestry, Ministry of Agriculture, Forests, Fisheries and Meteorology, Apia.

Part of the longer term objective is for some form of certification but this stage is still some time away. One forester has also been trained in forest certification procedures under the SPC programme. But beyond the forest management aspect of it, little in terms of policy or industry-related development is in place or planned to promote and support the marketing of certified forest products.

SPREP officers also advocated the use of some form of ecolabeling to enhance the handicraft (kava bowl) activities of one community involved in a forest conservation project for the conservation of ifilele (*Intsia bijuga*). However this idea never got off the ground, largely due to the lack of expertise in certification, particularly when the advocate left SPREP.

## **FINDINGS -**

- Group forest certification offers a less expensive option for small forest owners and managers to share certification costs and to overcome problems of diseconomies of scale. This option is clearly the logical one to take where local communities with small forest holdings are involved.
- Group certification may spread certification monitoring costs thin at the input level, however, diseconomies of scale at the output level of volumes harvested against steep marketing costs to remote and distant markets continues to present the single major constraint to profitability for certified entities (both group and individuals).
- There are other low costs schemes such as the *Ecotimber* certification and labeling scheme in New Zealand but this is limited to NZ markets only.
- Forest management certification, Chain-of-Custody certification and Joint Certification are various types of schemes an entity can subscribe to. For community-based operations, there are considerable transaction costs involved in the set-up phase. The transaction costs are likely to be high for local communities that are largely operating in the informal semi-subsistence economy, where the amount of work needed to formalize institutional arrangements necessary to satisfy the legal requirements of any forest certification under the FSC programme is significant.
- The EU-PNG Eco-Forestry experience points to the fickleness of community support for any income generating activity that is low-yielding and sophisticated under circumstances where other simpler alternatives for income exist.
- The development of an 'alternative' timber industry in PNG based on small portable eco-timber milling operations with aspirations for certification (as opposed to the conventional timber industry which is perceived as exploitative and non-sustainable) is not a replacement for the conventional industry. Consequently, rather than reducing the over-harvesting of forest resources, it has contributed to the overexploitation of forests in that country. This scenario is very likely in other Pacific Island countries. Forest certification may promote low-impact forest extraction and may lead to better utilized forest resources, but will not reduce over-harvesting. If anything, it will only add to

over-harvesting. Worse still, FC is likely to encourage logging of small forests of high conservation value that are presently unattractive to large scale logging due to any number of reasons, including physical isolation from markets, difficult terrains etc..

## **CONCLUSIONS –**

The above findings need to be put in context by clarifying that forest certification initiatives discussed in this report from PNG, Vanuatu and Solomon Islands were of projects which objective was primarily income generation and wherein the measure of success was inevitably, short term profitability. By presenting this objective to local communities, community expectations of levels of income were likely to have been inflated and frustration, loss of interest and waning commitment to FC quickly set in when these expectations were not fulfilled. Inevitably, communities turn to other more attractive options. This is an increasingly common and familiar outcome for many community-based projects in the Pacific and one that will continue to be repeated where the measure of success is short-term profitability.

Where (as it is assumed in this report) the Wildlife Conservation Society's interest is for forest certification to facilitate the conservation/protection of landscapes for a higher-level objective of biodiversity conservation, then short-term profitability may not necessarily be an appropriate measure of success or the only indicator used for gauging success.

Viewed in this context, noting as well that considerable work remains to be done to integrate several ecological concerns into the certification criteria and indicators, introducing forest certification as an income generation mechanism in support of a conservation objective will make possible its implementation without the hype of high income yielding expectations.

For WCS, the first requisite for achieving this is a conceptual one. It means building forest certification into landscape conservation, as opposed to building landscape conservation into forest certification. This is a subtle but very significant difference at the concept level that WCS should look into, and one that will have major implications for overall project design.



## **TASK 2 : WHO ARE THE RELEVANT INSTITUTIONS, INDUSTRIES AND INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE IMPORTANT IN ANY REGIONAL-LEVEL CERTIFICATION EFFORTS?**

The following matrix contains the regional and international organizations and funders with interest, expertise or some involvement in either forest certification specifically or area-based conservation or both. Some organizations and donors fund supportive activities such as capacity building. Donors also range from the major ones to small funders normally associated with funding specific short-term activities.

In the Comments column, I've provided some observations on the specific interests of the various organizations and how they may be able to contribute to or assist WCS.

#	<u>Institutions, organizations, companies</u>	Contact person & address	Comments
---	---	--------------------------	----------

### **Pacific Islands Regional Organizations**

1	<b>Secretariat for the Pacific Community (SPC)</b> Private Mail Bag, Suva Fiji Tel – 679 337 9228 Fax – 679 338 6326 Website: <a href="http://www.spc.int">http://www.spc.int</a>	Sairusi Bulai, Forests and Trees Adviser, Email – <a href="mailto:sairusib@spc.int">sairusib@spc.int</a>	Potential collaborator with interest in sustainable forest management and forest certification. Has been leading regional work on forest certification capacity building. Also a useful broker for funding from several multinational and bilateral funders including NZAID and AusAID.
2	<b>South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP)</b> P O Box 240, Apia, Samoa. Tel – 685 21929 Fax – 685 20231	Matt MacIntyre, Acting Coordinator – KRA Economic Development <a href="mailto:MattM@sprep.org.ws">MattM@sprep.org.ws</a>  Mary Power, Coastal Management Adviser, KRA – Nature Conservation Email - <a href="mailto:maryp@sprep.org.ws">maryp@sprep.org.ws</a>	Potential collaborator with interest in community -based conservation; useful broker for funding from several multinational and bilateral donors including NZAID, and AusAID.
3	<u>Forum Secretariat</u> Private Mail Bag, Suva Fiji Tel: 679 3312 Fax: 679 3305 Email: <a href="mailto:info@forsec.org.fj">info@forsec.org.fj</a>	John Low, Resources Adviser, Email – <a href="mailto:JohnL@forsec.org.fj">JohnL@forsec.org.fj</a>	Potential collaborator with interest in trade and exports marketing
4	<u>University of the South Pacific</u> PO Box 1168 Suva Ph: +679 3212546 / 3313900 Fax: +679 3301487	Prof. Randy Thaman Professor of Pacific Islands Biogeography University of the South Pacific Email: <a href="mailto:thaman_r@usp.ac.fj">thaman_r@usp.ac.fj</a>	Potential collaborator on capacity building and conservation management

**Pacific Regional NGO's**

5	<b>Foundation for the Peoples of the South Pacific (FSPi)</b> PO Box 951 Port Vila Vanuatu	Jenny Whyte Environment Specialist/IC Coordinator Ph: +678 22915 Fax: +678 24510 Email: <a href="mailto:jwhyte@fsp.org.vu">jwhyte@fsp.org.vu</a>	Potential conservation management collaborator; experience in Sustainable Forest Management; some experience in eco-labeling with forest products;
6	<b>World Wildlife Fund for Nature – South Pacific Programme</b>	Ms Kesaia Tabunakawai Regional Programme Director Email – <a href="mailto:ktabunakawai@wwfpacific.org.fj">ktabunakawai@wwfpacific.org.fj</a>	Potential capacity building and conservation management collaborator; very experience in community-based conservation.
7	<u>Conservation International</u> c/- SPREP/PROE PO Box/B.P. 240, Apia, Samoa Web: <a href="http://www.conservation.org">www.conservation.org</a>	Mr Francois Martel, Technical Director - Melanesia Ph: +685 21929 Fax: +685 20231 Direct tel/fax: +685 21593 Email: <a href="mailto:f.martel@conservation.org">f.martel@conservation.org</a>	Potential funder through the CEPF; very strong interest in hotspots protection and with easy access through CEPF funding.
8	<b>The Nature Conservancy</b> 4245 North Fairfax Dr. Suite 100 Arlington VA 22203 Web: <a href="http://www.nature.org">www.nature.org</a>	Patrick Maguire Conservation Finance Tools Specialist 4245 North Fairfax Dr. Suite 100 Arlington VA 22203 Ph: +1 703 841 8170 Fax: +1 703 841 4880 Email: <a href="mailto:pmaguire@tnc.org">pmaguire@tnc.org</a>  Egide Cantin Senior Conservation Finance & Capacity Building Specialist TNC PO Box 65506, Mairangi Bay Auckland, New Zealand Ph: +649 478-9632 Fax: +649 479-1944 Email: <a href="mailto:ecantin@global.net.pg">ecantin@global.net.pg</a> <a href="mailto:egide_cantin@hotmail.com">egide_cantin@hotmail.com</a>	Potential source of useful information and collaborator in capacity building. Founding member of the PI Roundtable.

**Multilateral Agencies and Organizations**

9	<u>Asian Development Bank</u> 6 ADB Avenue Mandaluyong City, Manila Philippines Ph: +632 632-6118 Fax: +632 636-2442	Daniele Ponzi Senior Economist (Environment) Email: <a href="mailto:dponzi@adb.org">dponzi@adb.org</a>	Potential funder who has just completed a Conservation Strategy for the Pacific and is apparently keen on putting that strategy into implementation with some major project support.
10	<u>UNESCO</u> P O Box 615, Apia, Samoa Ph: 685 24276 Fax: 685 22253	Elspeth Wingham World Heritage Officer 143 Culverden Road RD 2, Culverden North Canterbury 8272 Ph: +643 315 8432 Fax: +643 315 8403 Email: <a href="mailto:elspeth@wetlandsnz.co.nz">elspeth@wetlandsnz.co.nz</a>	Potential funder for landscape conservation under two separate programmes - the World Heritage Convention and Man and the Biosphere Program (MAB). The WHC has shifted its focus somewhat to marine areas but there is presently a strong interest in the Pacific Islands, and in transboundary sites (two or more sites spanning different countries even).

		Hans Dencker Thulstrup Regional Science Adviser UNESCO Apia Office Matautu-uta Apia Ph: +685 24276 Fax: +685 26593 Email: <a href="mailto:hans@unesco.org.ws">hans@unesco.org.ws</a>	The MAB Programme is gaining renewed momentum within the Pacific Islands with the strong support of Hans Thulstrup. The basic design of MABs also fits that I suspect of the areas WCS is looking at in Fiji, i.e. based on sustainable resource management and conservation.
11	<b>UNDP-GEF</b> Wisma UN, Japan Dungun Damansara Heights Kuala Lumpur Malaysia Ph: +03 20915172 Fax: +03 20952870	Mr. Tim Clairs Regional Coordinator - UNDP – GEF Email: <a href="mailto:tim.clairs@undp.org">tim.clairs@undp.org</a> or <a href="mailto:chandra.thangaraj@undp.org">chandra.thangaraj@undp.org</a>	Potential funder
12	<b>UNDP – Suva</b> UNDP Fiji Office, Tower Level 6, Reserve Bank Building Pratt Street, Suva, Fiji Islands Telephone: (679) 331 2500; Facsimile: (679) 330 1718; Official correspondence: <a href="mailto:fo.fiji@undp.org">fo.fiji@undp.org</a>	Ms Asenaca Ravuvu Ph: +679 331 2500 ext 606 Email: <a href="mailto:asenaca.ravuvu@undp.org">asenaca.ravuvu@undp.org</a>	Potential funder
14	<b>World Bank</b>	Sofia Bettencourt Senior Natural Resource Economist World Bank Office, Sydney Level 19, CML Building 14 Martin Place Sydney NSW 2000 Ph: +612 9235 6532 / 9223 7773 Mobile: +61 407 922 131 Fax: +612 9223 9903 email: <a href="mailto:sbettencourt@worldbank.org">sbettencourt@worldbank.org</a>	Potential funder; Bettencourt is a useful contact with very keen interest in nature conservation, and very strong supporter of community-based conservation area designs.
15	<b>Food and Agriculture Organization – Subregional Office for the Pacific Islands (FAO-SAPA)</b> FAO Private Mail Bag, Apia, Samoa Tel – 685 22127 Cable – FOODAGRI APIA (SAMOA) Fax – 685 22126 Email – <a href="mailto:FAO-SAPA@fao.org">FAO-SAPA@fao.org</a>	Mr. Aru Mathias, Forestry Officer, Email – <a href="mailto:Aru.Mathias@fao.org">Aru.Mathias@fao.org</a>	Keen interest in forest certification and have been supportive of SPC's work in this area. Possible source of technical assistance and funding.
16	<b>European Union (EU)</b>	Dr. Frans Baan, Head of Delegation 4 <sup>th</sup> Floor Development Bank Building, Victoria Parade, Suva. Tel 33 13 633 Fax 33 00 370	Potential funder for forest certification projects with funding experience in PNG.

		Email – eudelfiji@eu.org.fj	
--	--	-----------------------------	--

### Bilateral funders

17	<b>AusAID</b> GPO Box 887 Canberra ACT 2601 Australia Telephone +61 2 6206 4000 Fax +61 2 6206 4880 Ngo liason@ausaid.gov.au		Potential funder. Excerpt from AusAID's website re 2003-2004 aid budget – "Australia will provide bilateral support for renewable energy and improved water, waste and natural resource management. Australia's regional and multilateral support will include biodiversity conservation, climate change mitigation and adaptation, and phasing out of ozone depleting substances." Total environment aid that directly address environment is \$98M.
18	<b>NZAID</b> Private Mail Bag, Wellington, New Zealand	Roger Cornforth Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Private Mail Bag, Wellington, New Zealand Email: <a href="mailto:roger.cornforth@mfat.govt.nz">roger.cornforth@mfat.govt.nz</a> Ph: +644 473-2146 ext 8146 Fax + 644	Potential funder
19	<b>US Agency for International Development</b>	Tim Resch Manager, East Asia and Pacific, Environment Initiative US Agency for International Development 1300 Pennsylvania Ave NW Washington, DC 20523-4900 Ph: +1 202 712 4453 Fax: +1 202 216 3171 Email: <a href="mailto:TResch@usaid.gov">TResch@usaid.gov</a>	Potential funder.

### Private Foundations and International Non-Governmental Organizations

20	<b>The David &amp; Lucile Packard Foundation</b>	Bernd Cordes Program Officer The David & Lucile Packard Foundation 300 Second St. . Ste.200 Los Altos, CA 94022 Ph: +1 650 917 4703 Fax: +1 650 948 2957 Email: <a href="mailto:bcordes@packard.org">bcordes@packard.org</a>	Potential funder. Also member of the PI Roundtable.
21	<b>Forest Stewardship Council (FSC)</b> Forest Stewardship Council, A.C. Avenida Hidalgo 502 68000 Oaxaca, Oaxaca Mexico.	David Nahwegahbow, Chairman, FSC. Email – <a href="mailto:dndaystar@sprint.ca">dndaystar@sprint.ca</a>  Yati Bun, PNG-FSC Contact Person, Email – yabun@datec.net.pg	Certification certifier ; an international non-profit organization founded in 1993 to support environmentally appropriate, socially beneficial, and economically viable management of the world's forests; an international labeling scheme for forest products, which provides a credible guarantee that the product comes from a well-managed forest.  FSC also supports the development of national and

			local standards that implement the international Principles and Criteria of Forest Stewardship at the local level.
22	<b>MacArthur Foundation</b> 140 South Dearborn St, Suite 1100 Chicago IL. 60603 Tel – (312) 917-0304 Facsimile – (312) 917-0334 Website - <a href="http://www.macfound.org">www.macfound.org</a>	David Hulse Program Officer - Conservation & Sustainable Development MacArthur Foundation 140 South Dearborn St, Suite 1100 Chicago IL. 60603 Email – <a href="mailto:dhulse@macfound.org">dhulse@macfound.org</a>	Potential funder.
23	<b>Global Greengrants Fund</b>	Cedric Schuster <a href="mailto:cschuster@conservation.ws">cschuster@conservation.ws</a>  Pacific Environment Consultants Ltd., P O Box 3072, Apia, Samoa. Tel (685) 22932	GGF has been funding community -based conservation projects in Samoa, including funding for activities like bird watching tracks, community center and clinics. Usually small grants of up to US\$20k.

### International corporations engaged in forest certification

24	<b>KPMG FCSI (Forest Certification Services Inc),</b> P O Box 10426 777 Dunsmuir Street, Vancouver BC V7Y 1K3 Canada  Tel: + 1 604 691 3000/3376 Fax: + 1 604 691 3031 Website: <a href="http://www.kpmg.ca/">http://www.kpmg.ca/</a>	Mr. Andrew F. Howard; E-mail: <a href="mailto:afhoward@kpmg.ca">afhoward@kpmg.ca</a>	Certifying body for FSC active in the Oceania region.  Scope of accreditation: Worldwide for Forest Management
25	<b>BM TRADA Certification,</b> The e-Centre, Cooperage Way Business Village, Alloa Clackmannanshire FK10 3LP United Kingdom  Tel: + 44 1259 272142 Fax: + 44 1259 272 144 Website: <a href="http://www.bmtrada.com/">http://www.bmtrada.com/</a>	Mr. Alasdair McGregor; E-mail: <a href="mailto:amcgregor@bmtrada.com">amcgregor@bmtrada.com</a>	Certifying body for FSC  Scope of accreditation: Chain of Custody certification Worldwide
26	<b>SGS QUALIFOR,</b> SGS House, 217-221 London Road, Camberley Surrey GU15 3EY United Kingdom  Tel: + 44 12 76 697 667 Fax: + 44 12 76 697 666 Website: <a href="http://www.sgsgqualifor.com/">http://www.sgsgqualifor.com/</a>	Mr. Peter Marriott E-mail: <a href="mailto:Peter_Marriott@sgsgroup.com">Peter_Marriott@sgsgroup.com</a>	Certifying body for FSC; actively involved in PNG certified forests; very active in NZ.  Scope of accreditation: Worldwide for Forest Management and Chain of Custody

27	<b>Soil Association,</b> Bristol House, 40-56 Victoria Street, Bristol BS1 6BY United Kingdom  Tel: + 44 117 914 2435 Fax: + 44 117 925 2504 Website: <a href="http://www.soilassociation.org/">http://www.soilassociation.org/</a>	Mr. Kevin Jones / Ms. Meriel Robson E-mail: <a href="mailto:wm@soilassociation.org">wm@soilassociation.org</a>	Certifying Body for FSC  Scope of accreditation: Worldwide for Forest Management and Chain of Custody
28	<b>Scientific Certification Systems,</b> 2000 Powell St., Suite 1350, Emeryville California 94608 United States Tel: + 1 510 452 8007 Fax: + 1 510 452 8001 Website: <a href="http://www.scs1.com/">http://www.scs1.com/</a>	Dr. Robert Hrubes; E-mail: <a href="mailto:rhrubes@scscertified.com">rhrubes@scscertified.com</a>	Certifying body for FSC  Scope of accreditation: Worldwide for Forest Management and Chain of Custody
29	<b>Smart Wood Program,</b> Goodwin-Baker Building, 65 Millet Street, Richmond Vermont 05477 United States  Tel: + 1 802 434 5491 Fax: + 1 802 434 3116 Website: <a href="http://www.smartwood.org/">http://www.smartwood.org/</a>	W. Robert Beer; E-mail: <a href="mailto:info@smartwood.org">info@smartwood.org</a>	Certifying Body for FSC; actively involved with Solomon Islands forest certification projects; very active in NZ.  Scope of accreditation: Worldwide for Forest Management and Chain of Custody
30	<b>Pacific Islands Roundtable For Nature Conservation</b>	Audrey Newman, The Nature Conservancy Email – <a href="mailto:anewman@tnc.org">anewman@tnc.org</a>	Useful informal group for meeting and accessing donors and other conservation organizations active in the Pacific Islands region in nature conservation. An absolute must for effective networking in the Pacific Islands region.

### Private Consulting Companies & Individuals

31	<b>Lenoa Forestry Consulting Services</b> GPO Box 14377, Suva FIJI	Lemeki Lenoa Tel – 679 993 7781/Mobile – 679 993 7781 Email – <a href="mailto:lenoa@is.com.fj">lenoa@is.com.fj</a>	Experienced forester with involvement in SPC's capacity building studies and workshops on forest certification.
----	---	--	---

32	<b>Pacific Environment Consultants Ltd (PECL)</b> P O Bpx 3702, Apia, Samoa	Sam Sesega Tel – 685 31490 Fax - 685 22938 Email – <a href="mailto:samsesega@conservation.org">samsesega@conservation.org</a>	Highly experienced outfit specializing in biodiversity conservation and resource management with a lot of community-level experience in the Pacific Islands.
33	<b>Dick Watling</b>	259 Princess Road, Tamavua, Suva, Fiji Tel: (679) 383-189 Fax: (679) 381-818 Email: <a href="mailto:watling@is.com.fj">watling@is.com.fj</a>	Ornithologist with wide expertise and interest in ecology and conservation; also involved in SPC forest certification training as consultant trainer.
34	<b>Joachim Droste</b>		Certification Consultant for GFA Terra Systems
35	<b>Jeff Hayward</b> Trainer Asia Pacific Regional Manager SmartWood Program Rainforest Alliance C/o LATIN, Jl. Astrajinnga Raya No. 7 Bogor 16153 Indonesia	Contact numbers – Tel (62) 251 337 417 Fax (62) 251 337 417 Email – <a href="mailto:jhayward@smartwood.org">jhayward@smartwood.org</a>	Potential trainer.
36	<b>Rainforest Alliance</b>	Refer to SmartWood Program	

### Others

37	<b>Royal Forests and Birds Society of New Zealand</b>  172 Taranaki Street P O Box 631 Wellington New Zealand  Ph: (64) (04) 385 7374 Fax: (64) (04) 385 7373 Email: <a href="mailto:office@wn.forest-bird.org.nz">office@wn.forest-bird.org.nz</a>		Ngo with interest and active involvement in the conservation of forests in the Pacific Islands. A potential source of technical experts for specific scientific studies.
38	<b>University of Technology, Lae, PNG</b>	Kulala Mutung, HOD Forestry	Has an active forestry degree programme and may be able to contribute to research and capacity building on forest certification.
39	<b>Pacific Islands Roundtable For Nature Conservation</b>	Audrey Newman, The Nature Conservancy Email – <a href="mailto:anewman@tnc.org">anewman@tnc.org</a>  Kate Brown SPREP <a href="mailto:kateb@sprep.org.ws">kateb@sprep.org.ws</a>	Useful informal group for meeting and accessing donors and other conservation organizations active in the Pacific Islands region in nature conservation. An absolute must for effective networking in the Pacific Islands region.

### **TASK 3: WHAT ARE THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN SPREP, SPC AND OTHER RELATED BODIES IN REGARDS TO FOREST CERTIFICATION EFFORTS?**

### **SPC and SPREP - mandates**

The Secretariat for the Pacific Community (SPC) and the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) are both intergovernmental regional organizations belonging to Pacific Island countries.

SPREP has a specific mandate – to deal with environmental issues. SPC has a more expansive mandate spanning from health issues on one hand to agriculture, fisheries and forests on the other.

Whilst in the past, there was clear demarcation between environment and natural resources such as forests, that were under SPC's mandate, the advent of the concept of sustainable use and sustainable management, has blurred this line of demarcation considerably. SPC now actively promotes the concept of Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) extending this approach from the management of both natural forests and plantations earmarked for large-scale industrial exploitation at one extreme, to non-timber products and other forest services at one end.

SPREP on the other hand advocates for the conservation of biodiversity making the distinction between agricultural biodiversity as that which falls under SPC's agricultural mandate, and 'biodiversity in the wild' as that which come under SPREP's sphere of work. Under this understanding, all natural forests of high conservation/biodiversity value come under its scrutiny and in these areas, conservation and development objectives often clash. Note however that SPREP only advocates for conservation, and provide information and advice to assist member countries in deciding on which options of use to take.

SPREP has also shifted quite significantly since 1992's Agenda 21 from the previous emphasis on strict protection of areas and species using national parks and nature reserves, to a mix of tools that encompass and promote the sustainable management and harvesting of resources, and the incorporating of local communities into the management of - as the new term now is - conservation areas.

The concept of conservation areas that SPREP pioneered between 1991 – 2001 has, as one of its central design elements, the use of income generating activities to support conservation objectives. (Herein is the entry point for activities or tools such as forest certification in to a conservation area design). During this period, SPREP has been heavily involved in ecotourism development as a sustainable and non-extractive activity for pursuing conservation objectives. In other communities, sustainable forest harvesting for high quality uses such as handicrafts (e.g. kava bowls in Samoa), and bee-keeping/honey production have been very successful. Only in one project in Samoa was ecolabelling of kava bowls was planned but this never got off the ground.

On the whole, SPREP has no hands-on experience in forest certification. Conceptually however, forest certification would be seen as an income-generating tool that promotes sustainable resource use, facilitates the involvement and participation of local communities and in these two ways, contribute to the overall conservation of resources and biodiversity.

### **GTZ and forest certification -**



GTZ's interest in sustainable forest management brings it into the ambit of SPC's Forests and Trees Programme, and the two have been collaborating closely in several projects around the region, including joint sponsoring of certification workshops.

GTZ's Sustainable Forest Management project such as the one in Samoa effectively lays the groundwork for subsequent forest certification. At the Samoa project for instance, the guidelines of steps in forest management that precedes certification is effectively followed. And while there is still some way to go, forest certification is the objective. The Samoa Forestry Division who administers the GTZ funded project has also had one trained officer in forest certification and is looking at strengthening further its capacity in this area.

In private discussions with GTZ's Evelyn Reigber in 2002, we both agreed that there is closer similarity in GTZ's and SPREP's approach to promoting sustainable forest management than between GTZ and SPC. The main similarity with SPREP (and conversely the difference with SPC) is GTZ's focus on community-based sustainable resource management, something which SPREP actively promotes for area-based conservation and has considerable experience in, but which SPC does not emphasize and thus lacks experience in. Because of this, both Evelyn and I were keen to explore collaboration at the project level. However this never eventuated.

A GTZ delegation was meant to visit SPREP in early February 2003 and one of the areas expected to discuss was collaboration in community-based forest conservation projects. This meeting did not take place when the trip's PNG leg was cancelled for security reasons, and I have not heard recently if this interest had been pursued further.

#### **Regional efforts to coordinate work –**

Recognizing the potential for duplication of work and overlapping of responsibilities, and the inefficient use of donor funds this inevitably brings about, the Pacific Islands regional organizations have created a body call CROP – Council of Regional Organizations of the Pacific – which is comprised of the heads of the various 8 regional organizations<sup>2</sup>. This body decides on projects that falls across the turf boundaries and determines which organization takes the lead and how implementing responsibilities are to be divided.

Recently, contentious issues such as biosafety, traditional ecological knowledge and the conservation of plant genetic resources have been discussed in this forum, specifically on the matter of how SPREP and SPC should relate to these. The outcome is an interesting mix of compromises that may or may not solve the identified problems of overlaps and duplication. The point is, however, a mechanism for coordinating work is in place that is respected by all. Any likely complications that may emerge in relations to forest certification will be resolved within this forum, if SPC and SPREP could not between themselves agree on how best to collaborate if the areas of responsibility of both organizations are involved.

#### **Forest Certification, SPC and SPREP -**

To date, SPC in collaboration with GTZ has been taking the lead role in promoting awareness of FC and in building regional capacity for forest certification within the Pacific Islands. Given

---

<sup>2</sup> ForSec, SPC, SPREP, SOPAC, USP, SPTO, FFA and PIDP

that this has largely been focused on the production side of forest management, SPREP considers this as falling clearly into SPC's area of work.

However, the use of forest certification to promote landscape conservation, or vice versa (i.e. of landscape conservation to promote forest certification), will require the participation of both (SPC and SPREP) possibly to varying degrees and at different times in the life of any conservation-FC initiative. How and in what way, will be a matter of purpose and project design. (I've flagged this in my Conclusions earlier under Task 1).

If the ultimate objective is 'production' oriented – it be sustainable use or resource development, with forest certification a tool for promoting SFM, the appropriate regional organization to be engaged is SPC. If the ultimate objective is 'protection', with forest certification intended to generate income and to reduce harvesting of species and areas where the protection of biodiversity values is the long term objective, then SPREP would be the appropriate regional player to assume a key role.

It is likely however that both organizations as well as GTZ can contribute regardless of the emphasis of the project, and it would be strategically wise to consult both sooner than later.

One of the key areas is the development of context-specific criteria, indicators and management guidelines to better align forest certification to operate within a biodiversity conservation context. For this specific activity, SPC, SPREP and GTZ have clear contributions to make and should be co-opted into a task team to undertake this work.

**TASK 4: ARE THERE ANY SPREP PROGRAMMES OR FUNDING THAT COULD OR SHOULD BE LINKED TO OUR EFFORTS TO IMPLEMENT A LANDSCAPE-SCALE CERTIFICATION APPROACH IN FIJI, OR TO ANY OF THE OTHER ACTIVITIES WE ARE UNDERTAKING IN THE FIRST YEAR OF THIS PROJECT?**

**SPREP –**

Since November 2002, SPREP has been undertaking a major review of all its Key Result Areas with a view towards shifting into a programmatic approach, and away from the project based approach of the past. As part of this review, the nature conservation area has been renamed KRA Natural Resources Management and the initial key programmes proposed were to be

- (1) ecosystems conservation,
  - marine ecosystems conservation
  - terrestrial (including freshwater) ecosystems conservation
  - atolls ecosystem conservation
- (2) species protection
  - regional marine threatened species protection
  - biosafety
  - avifauna species protection and
  - regional terrestrial threatened species protection
- (3) conventions and regional coordinating mechanisms.

It is possible that these three programme areas may be consolidated into one large programme called Natural Resources Management Programme, with the various areas above treated as sub-programmes and components. This was a preference mooted by some of SPREP's Management members. The final shape of the SPREP programme(s) in nature conservation and resource management should be known within the next 4 weeks at the latest.

The actual status quo, however, has the following projects that continues to date –

- Integrated Coastal Management Project
- Regional Avifauna Conservation Project
- Regional Invasive & Alien Species Project
- Regional Marine Mammals Conservation Project

None of these deals with the specific application or promotion of forest certification. Of interest to WCS is the glaring absence of a terrestrial conservation programme. This is something that SPREP is very concerned about, and the organization is working earnestly to address this. The background to this omission is protracted. Suffice to say that terrestrial conservation constitute about 80% of SPREP's nature conservation programme until the end of the South Pacific Biodiversity Programme at the end of 2001. Funding constraints and poor planning lead to the current situation, which the new Director is very concerned and aware about.

Also, despite not having a terrestrial conservation programme per se, there are country projects initiated under SPBCP that are continuing many of whom depend on SPREP for technical backstopping. This service no longer exists until SPREP recruits an Action Strategy

Coordinator (this person is envisaged to have some terrestrial conservation background and will, as part of his responsibilities, be required to provide some backstopping for terrestrial conservation work).

SPREP however is committed to community-based conservation. At present there is considerable work in marine conservation using this approach, and the same approach now dominates terrestrial conservation management in most Pacific Islands, as a result of the SPBCP, which pioneered the approach using 17 projects in 12 Pacific Island Countries.

Its programme-based funding proposal to AusAID and NZAID for 2003 includes resources for a terrestrial conservation sub-programme that will continue to promote and assist in the setting up and management of conservation areas that is community-based, ecosystems-based and with a significant component of income generating conservation enterprises to promote sustainable management and support community development aspirations.

This would be a useful and potentially useful source for WCS to tap into. Contact person within SPREP would be either one of the following Mary Power ([maryp@sprep.org.ws](mailto:maryp@sprep.org.ws)) or Liz Dovey ([lizd@sprep.org.ws](mailto:lizd@sprep.org.ws)).

## **OTHER CURRENT SPREP PROGRAMMES AND PROJECTS WITH POTENTIAL LINKS TO WCS'S FOREST CERTIFICATION INTERESTS -**

### **CI's CEPF's Ecosystem Profiling exercise –**

WCS's activities Activity 1.1 & 1.4 are near-identical to those which Conservation International (CI) are undertaking on a regional level including Fiji, for the development of an Ecosystem Profile and Funding strategy for the Polynesia-Micronesia Hotspot. SPREP provides some administrative and logistical assistance but by and large, this is a CI project. Contact person is either Francois Martel ([fmartel@conservation.org](mailto:fmartel@conservation.org)) or James Atherton ([jamesa@sprep.org.ws](mailto:jamesa@sprep.org.ws)).

### **SPREP's Invasive Species Programme –**

Activity 2.2 addressing threats may find some benefit in linking into SPREP's work on invasive species, largely on the argument that after overexploitation, alien invasive species is the next major threat to ecosystems and species in the Pacific Region.

Contact person is Liz Dovey ([ldovey@sprep.org.ws](mailto:ldovey@sprep.org.ws))

### **Pacific Islands Community-based Conservation Management Course**

SPREP and USP has been running the above training course out of USP-Laucala campus. It is a useful training course that is built on recent experience with community-based conservation projects from around the region and should contribute to WCS Objective 4. The course was discontinued in 2002 but there are plans for continuation in 2003.

Contact person is Frank Wickham, Training Officer for SPREP ([fwickham@sprep.org.ws](mailto:fwickham@sprep.org.ws)).

**Pacific Islands Roundtable for Nature Conservation – 1 – 4 July, 2003, SPREP, Apia, Samoa**

This activity should be of interest in terms of developing your network of contacts amongst conservation organizations and donors that are active in supporting conservation work in the Pacific Islands region. Strongly recommended.

Contact person is Kate Brown ([kbrown@sprep.org.ws](mailto:kbrown@sprep.org.ws)). This is an informal and voluntary group that offers excellent opportunities for the building partnership, sharing information, and coordinating your work with others doing similar work around the region.

**TASK 5: ARE THERE DONORS BEYOND THE USAID WHO MIGHT BE INTERESTED IN SUPPORTING THE KIND OF APPROACHES WE ARE ADVOCATING FOR FOREST CONSERVATION.**

The most promising sources beyond USAID that WCS should look to are the following –

- CI-CEPF (Critical Ecosystems Partnership Fund)
- GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY (GEF)
- MAN and the BIOSPHERE (MAB) Program
- NZAID – PIE

Other potential donors are listed in the matrix of donors, organizations etc under Task 2.

The above four are discussed below.

**CONSERVATION INTERNATIONAL – CRITICAL ECOSYSTEM PARTNERSHIP FUND (CEPF)**

CEPF is a joint initiative of Conservation International (CI), the World Bank, the Global Environment Facility (GEF), the MacArthur Foundation and the Government of Japan. The fund is US\$150 million and is intended to engage civil society in biodiversity conservation work aimed at protecting the biodiversity hotspots of the globe as identified by CI. This year, the CEPF Donor Council has approved the Polynesia/Micronesia Hotspot for funding under this initiative. A Conservation Investment Strategy is currently under development together with a Ecosystem Profile for the region that will identify priorities for funding. For each region, grant funding is in the range of US\$3.0 to \$10M. The Fiji archipelago is without a doubt one of the richest and most diverse in terms of biodiversity within this hotspot and has excellent chances of being funded.

Funding is expected to come on stream early in 2004. The contact person is Francois Martel (CI Office in Apia – refer to matrix for contact address).

For more information, also refer to website [www.cepf.net](http://www.cepf.net).

**GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY (GEF) -**

The following eligibility criteria for GEF funding qualify WCS and Fiji for project funding for biodiversity conservation.

“Any eligible individual or group may propose a project, which must meet two key criteria: It must reflect national or regional priorities and have the support of the country or countries involved, and it must improve the global environment or advance the prospect of reducing risks to it. GEF project ideas may be proposed directly to UNDP, UNEP, or the World Bank.

Country eligibility to receive funding is determined in two ways. Developing countries that have ratified the relevant treaty are eligible to propose biodiversity and climate change projects. Other countries, primarily those with economies in transition, are

eligible if the country is a party to the appropriate treaty and is eligible to borrow from the World Bank or receive technical assistance grants from UNDP.

Also the following types of funding is available from GEF for biodiversity conservation projects that WCS should consider -

**Full-size projects.** GEF's three implementing agencies (and soon RDBs) work with the operational focal point in each recipient country to develop project ideas that are consistent both with the country's national programs and priorities and with GEF's operational strategy and programs. Regional or global programs and projects may be developed in all countries that endorse the proposed activity.

**Medium-Sized Projects (MSPs).** Grants of less than US\$1 million are available through expedited procedures that speed processing and implementation. These medium-sized grants increase GEF's flexibility in programming resources and encourage a wider range of interested parties to propose and develop project concepts.

**Enabling Activities.** Grants for enabling activities help countries to prepare national inventories, strategies, and action plans in cooperation with the Convention on Biological Diversity and the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change. This assistance enables countries to assess biodiversity and climate change challenges from a national perspective, determine the most promising opportunities for project development, and subsequently pursue full-scale projects.

**Project Preparation and Development Facility (PDF).** Funding for project preparation is available in three categories or "blocks." Block A grants (up to \$25,000) fund the very early stages of project or program identification, and are approved through GEF's implementing agencies. Block B grants (up to \$350,000) fund information gathering necessary to complete project proposals and provide necessary supporting documentation. These grants are approved by the GEF CEO, with attention to the GEF operations committee's recommendations. Block C grants (up to \$1 million) provide additional financing, where required, for larger projects to complete technical design and feasibility work. Block C grants are normally made available after a project proposal is approved by the GEF Council.

For further information on GEF, refer to [www.gefweb.org](http://www.gefweb.org).

### **UNESCO'S MAB PROGRAMME – ASPACO**

There is renewed interest in the Man and Biosphere (MAB) Program within the Pacific Islands with the interest and energy provided by the UNESCO Apia Scientific Adviser Hans Thulstrup. As part of the MAB Programme, the Asia-Pacific Co-operation for the Sustainable Use of Renewable Natural Resources in Biosphere reserves and Similar Managed Area (ASPACO) give emphasis to the role of biosphere reserves as catalysts for both conservation and development. It aims at providing a substantial contribution to these efforts by developing integrated strategies for the preservation of biodiversity in coastal zones and small islands with particular emphasis on third world countries. Training, capacity-building and the increase of local capabilities for research and management of sustainable use of renewable natural resources are key elements of the project.

For more information refer to [www.unesco.org/mab/aspaco](http://www.unesco.org/mab/aspaco). For contact address, refer to Task 2 Matrix.

### **NZ AID-PACIFIC INITIATIVE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT (PIE) –**

The PIE is an easily accessible facility for funding conservation activities under categories that are tabled below. The PIE's goal is “to provide support to Pacific Island societies to better manage their environments”.

The five categories of the PIE are:

- Capacity Building For Environmental Management
- Bio-Diversity And Resource Management
- Responses To Climate Change
- Waste Management
- Phasing Out Ozone-Depleting Substances

The PIE will fund projects, which help people of the Pacific region to deal with the various threats to endemic species. It will do this by helping them develop the capacity to manage and conserve the biodiversity of the region.

**The PIE currently focuses on the following areas of urgent need. These are:**

- Support for community-based conservation areas.
- Support for adoption of resource management and use activities by local communities which: are economically viable; are socially acceptable; are environmentally sound; can conserve biodiversity; and can be managed sustainably in the long-term. Such activities might include resource management to protect, for example, soils, fresh water, corals and forests.
- Distributing information on biodiversity and environmental resource management, regionally, nationally and locally.
- Halting the invasion of exotic species.

For more information, refer to [www.nzaid.govt.nz](http://www.nzaid.govt.nz).

\*\*\*\*\*



### References and People consulted:

1. European Forest Institute (19\_\_). Forest Products Certification- Country Reports.
2. Forest Stewardship Council. Forests Certified by FSC-Accredited Certification Bodies. DOC 5.3.3. April 29, 2003. <http://www.fscoax.org>.
3. \_\_\_\_\_. FSC Principles and Criteria. Document 1.2 Revised February 2000. <http://www.fscoax.org>.
4. \_\_\_\_\_. Group Certification: FSC Guidelines for Certification Bodies Doc. 3.6.1 31 July 1998. <http://www.fscoax.org>.
5. \_\_\_\_\_. Certification Guidelines and Applications. <http://www.fscoax.org>
6. \_\_\_\_\_. Group CoC Certification – FSC Guidelines for Certifying Bodies. <http://www.fscoax.org>.
7. Hayward, J. 2001. Raising Forest Industry Awareness of Forest Certification in the South Pacific, 3 – 5 October, 2001 – Workshop Report. Fiji Forestry Department/SPC/GTZ.
8. Lenoa, L. 2002. Papua New Guinea National Workshop on ITTO (SFM) Criteria and Indicators, 6 – 9 August, 2002, Lae Morobe Province, PNG. SPC-GTZ Pacific German Regional Forestry Project.
9. Lenoa, L. 2002. Vanuatu National Workshop on ITTO (SFM) Criteria and Indicators. 10 – 13 September, 2002, Port Vila, Vanuatu. EC-BMZ-DFID Project for ACP Countries.
10. Lenoa, L., Watling, D., & Vetiduadua, C. 2002. Regional Workshops on “ Training of Trainers in Forest Certification and Mandate, Procedures, Tasks and Duties of National Working Groups on Forest Certification.” 28 Oct – 1 Nov., 2002. SPC/GTZ-Pacific German Regional Forestry Project.
11. Lenoa, L. 2002. “Development of Capacity Building Strategies in Forest Certification in the Pacific Region”. Final Project Report. SPC/GTZ, Suva.
12. Personal communications: Sesega/Jenny Whyte. FSPI (email, May 2003).
13. Personal communications: Sesega/Morgan Armstrong. FSPI (email, May 2003).
14. Personal communications: Sesega/Sami Lemalu, Forestry Division, Ministry of Agriculture, Forests, Fisheries and Meteorology. Apia, Samoa May 2003.
15. SPC-GTZ. 2002. Capacity Building Strategies in Forest Certification in the Pacific, 25 – 26 March 2002, Nadi, Fiji – Workshop Report.

16. Personal communications. Sesega/Grantman, Rosoman. GreenPeace. (Email - 24 May 2003)
17. Personal communications/ Sam Sesega/David Nahwegahbow, FSC Chairman, Ottawa . [dndaystar@sprint.ca](mailto:dndaystar@sprint.ca)
18. Personal communications: Sesega/Sairusi B, SPC Forests and Trees Adviser. April/May 2003.

\*\*\*\*\*